NOTE: This order is nonprecedential.

United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit

ILLUMINA, INC., ILLUMINA CAMBRIDGE LTD., Plaintiffs-Appellees

 \mathbf{v} .

QIAGEN, N.V., QIAGEN GMBH, QIAGEN GAITHERSBURG, INC., QIAGEN SCIENCES, LLC, QIAGEN INC. (USA), QIAGEN REDWOOD CITY, INC., INTELLIGENT BIO-SYSTEMS, INC.,

Defendants-Appellants

2016-2709

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Northern District of California in No. 3:16-cv-02788-WHA, Judge William H. Alsup.

ON MOTION

Before Dyk, O'Malley, and Wallach, *Circuit Judges*. O'Malley, *Circuit Judge*.

ORDER

Appellants QIAGEN, N.V. et al. move to stay, pending this appeal, the preliminary injunction issued by the

Case: 16-2709 Document: 36 Page: 2 Filed: 10/25/2016

ILLUMINA, INC. v. QIAGEN, N.V.

2

United States District Court for the Northern District of California. Appellees Illumina, Inc. et al. oppose the motion.

Rule 8(a)(2) of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure authorizes this court to grant a stay of an injunction pending appeal. Our determination is governed by four factors, the first two of which are the most critical: (1) whether the movant has made a strong showing of likelihood of success on the merits; (2) whether the movant will be irreparably injured absent a stay; (3) whether issuance of the stay will substantially injure the other parties interested in the proceeding; and (4) where the public interest lies. See Nken v. Holder, 556 U.S. 418, 434 (2009).

Based on the papers submitted by the parties and without prejudicing the ultimate disposition of this case by a merits panel, we conclude that appellants have not established that a stay of the preliminary injunction pending appeal is warranted here.

Upon consideration thereof,

IT IS ORDERED THAT:

The motion is denied.

FOR THE COURT

/s/ Peter R. Marksteiner Peter R. Marksteiner Clerk of Court